DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 202 JC 740 194

AUTHOR	Martorana, S. V.
TITLE	State-Level Planning for Community Colleges: Are the 1202 Commissions a Centripetal or Centrifugal Force in Postsecondary Education? Essays on Education, No. 4.
INSTITUTION	American Coll. Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa.
PUB DATE	Jan 74
NOTE	19p.
AVAILABLE FROM	ACT Publications, P.O. Box 168, Iowa 52240 (single copy $1.10, 10 or more copies $0.50 each)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Data Analysis; Data Collection; *Federal Legislation; Higher Education; Information Processing; *Junior Colleges; *Post Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

In this essay, discussions are presented of the current setting within which statewide planning for community/junior colleges is operating, the "impact" of the "1202 Commissions" proposed in the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318), simultaneous related special interests in information, and salient implications for community/junior college education. In relation to the current condition in the U.S., five observations are made: (1) the colleges and universities are on the defensive; (2) there is an intensifying interest in "accountability" of higher education; (3) there is a redefinition of the educational enterprise to recognize the validity of the concept of "postsecondary education" as opposed to "higher education"; (4) the assumptions on which long range planning for postsecondary education is now being projected are changing; and (5) more attention is being given to the needs for adequate information and data for decision making and planning. The "1202 Commission" proposals--the designation of a commission to represent broadly all postsecondary agencies and institutions in each State and to be responsible for developing a comprehensive plan for the State--have had a large impact even in face of a stop action from Washington. Conclusions are drawn, and recommendations are made. (DB)

ED 092202

ESSAYS ON EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NUMBER FOUR IN A SERIES

State-Level Planning for Community Colleges: Are the 1202 Commissions a Centripetal or Centrifugal Force in Postsecondary Education?

S.V. MARTORANA
Penn State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE TESTING PROGRAM

The American College Testing Program (ACT) is dedicated to the enrichment of education. It was founded as a public trust and operates as a nonprofit corporation governed by elected educational representatives from individual states or regions, and by a Board of Trustees.

A fundamental goal of ACT is to exercise educational leadership through guidance-oriented assessment and research services in order to (1) assist in the identification and solution of educational problems and (2) communicate to the general and professional publics knowledge and ideas about education.

The chief beneficiaries of ACT's services are students, secondary schools, institutions of postsecondary education, and educational researchers.

Published January 1974
by The American College Testing Program

Price: Single copy $1; 10 or more, $.50 each. (Check or money order must accompany request.)

For additional copies write:
ACT Publications, P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

STATE-LEVEL PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES: ARE THE 1202 COMMISSIONS A CENTRIPETAL OR CENTRIFUGAL FORCE IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION*

PROLOGUE

In statewide planning and coordination it is important to keep a healthy balance between forces which tend to drive higher educational institutions apart and into competitive behaviors, and those which pull them together into an overly centralized bureaucratically-controlled structure. Broward Culpepper, a founding father of the State Higher Education Officers Organization dramatized this problem with this story:

At the time, he was Executive Director of the University System in Florida, living in a suburban area of Tallahassee. One day, there was a construction project going on in this suburban neighborhood and Mrs. Culpepper was overseeing the play of some children. She noticed that everything became very quiet. When children get quiet, of course, you need to check to see what is wrong. When she went out to investigate, she found there were five children looking down into a test-hole used in house construction to check the absorption rate of water into the soil. Perplexed, Mrs. Culpepper quietly walked up to where the five children were looking into this hole so intently. They were looking down at five rather young, but quite active, little skunks. Before she thought, she yelled shrilly, "Run, children, run!" Whereupon, each of the children reached down, grabbed a skunk, and ran off in a different direction!

I do not know if you are going to think of the "1202 Commissions," the behavior of colleges and universities, and the leadership as being the skunks that are attracting the attention *or* the children who run in all directions. However, there is good reason to believe that the forces and the people involved in statewide operations of postsecondary education, including those responsible for planning and coordination as well as those who have either statewide or campus governing authority over colleges and universities are behaving like Culpepper's kids. After first being attracted to group collective action by what appeared to be a great idea —"comprehensive statewide planning" as described in P.L. 92-318,—now at least some are labelling it as a smelly snare. At the same time they are also displaying intention and even eagerness to grab a piece of it and run off!

I shall attempt to show *both* the appropriateness of the figure just used and, hopefully, the possibilities for constructive, positive, corrective action you may wish to take on behalf of community-junior college education in the

statewide planning activities of your several states. Accordingly, this presentation is organized around the following things:

1. The current setting generally in the United States within which statewide planning for community-junior colleges is having to operate.

2. The "impact" of the "1202 Commissions" proposed in the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318).

3. Relating topics one and two to simultaneous great interest in "information."

4. Pointing out some salient implications for community-junior college education.

5. Drawing some tentative conclusions with respect to these institutions.

6. Suggesting a few recommendations to state-level planners, administrators, and decision makers interested in community-junior college programs and institutional operations, their strengthening and improvement.

* * *

The Current Setting

Five observations about the relevant current condition in the United States are worthy of note.

First, "higher education" in America is "on the defensive." Many do not believe that this general posture of defensiveness is either necessary or desirable. Nevertheless, the colleges and universities in this country are on the defensive. They have lost the initiatives they held in the early 60s. Their leadership in the main is reacting to propositions (*sic PLANS*) of others outside of the academic enterprise rather than exerting influence on behalf of their constituencies and institutions on the outside decision makers.

To document this idea, I refer you simply to such writings as Lyman Glenny's "The Anonymous Leaders of Higher Education," reported in the January 1971 *AGB Reports*, and the public press treatment of the "ineffectiveness" of college education as believed to be supported by Sandy Astin's ACE data.

Second, and somewhat related is the intensifying interest in "accountability" of higher education. The cry for *accounting* by colleges

and universities of all types for use of the resources provided for their operations against "measurable" and "demonstrable" and "stated" outcomes and productivity is heard all around.

I do *not* wish to be misunderstood. I am not decrying this fact or saying it is not good or needed. The points of significance here are three:

1. The pressures for accountability are real and present and will apparently last.

2. This fact is of high significance in making the case for and molding the nature of state planning.

3. The press for *accountability* is in large measure the causal force behind the press for *more* and better information about college and university operations and results.

In my judgment, it would be wise to consider reversing our field in our drive for more and better *information* on higher education, moving away from a justification based on *management* toward one based on *accountability*. I believe it *would* be,

1. better received by the *operating institutions*;

2. better supported by the taxpayers; and

3. *much more* easy to define, explain, and justify to all concerned.

When you gather information stressing *management*, the implication is always that this information is wanted for control purposes—to manipulate, to structure, to govern. This frightens and alienates the operating levels of the institutions. If the request for information from the operating levels, on the other hand, were to be justified on the basis of *accounting* for that which is done and for *evaluating* results, the connotation given is very different. On this basis there will be:

1. preassignments of mission or purpose,

2. provision of resources to get the mission done, and

3. post-audits rather than pre-audits of various kinds to assess efficiency and productivity.

The resulting impact on the operating field will be entirely different.

A *third* important factual development impinging on today's climate for state planning is the redefinition of the American educational enterprise to recognize the validity of the concept of "postsecondary education" as opposed to "higher education." That this change has a growing impetus is evident in many ways. For example, the expansion of the NCHEMS project includes more specifically items relating to occupational (vocational and technical) programs and other measures more characteristically of interest and use in community-junior colleges, technical institutes, and related types of educational institutions than in bachelors' and higher degree-granting colleges and universities. The intention in NCHEMS to continue to recognize the "postsecondary" view is clear in this quote from the February 28, 1973 WICHE, NCHEMS *Newsletter*:

> Through the Education Amendments of 1972, Congress has begun to remove some of the traditional distinctions between higher education and the other sectors of post-secondary education. The Amendments clearly signal the intent of Congress to begin considering all postsecondary education programs in a consistent and parallel way. . . . Recognizing the pressures on NCHEMS to expand its view of higher education to include all of postsecondary education, the NCHEMS Board of Directors has asked the NCHEMS staff to determine appropriate ways for the Board to expand its efforts in keeping with a broader range of postsecondary education.

The report goes on to call for a well-defined, systematic, and integrated body of information to relate to this expanded definition of the post-secondary education enterprise. One important aspect of such action is its possible effect in bringing the MIS Program more into line with community and technical colleges than the baccalaureate institutions, or at least to achieve a better balance between these two institutional levels.

Of course, the strongest thrust toward a nationwide acceptance and improved understanding of the "postsecondary" education concept came from passage of the Federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972. Among other things, this sparked establishment of the National Commission on Financing Postsecondary Education. The idea is rapidly catching on and is being propounded in other places. In New York State, for example, the report of the most recent "blue ribbon" commission to study the financing of higher education, popularly termed the "Keppel Report," openly but lamely admits to the new concept. The Commission asserted that to perform its task completely and effectively it had to consider all "postsecondary education." This it defined to include all types of institutions providing post-high school programs, differentiated from "higher education" which it defined as "formally recognized colleges and universities."

The *fourth* significant trend is the changing assumptions on which long-range planning for postsecondary education is being projected now, as

opposed to those of the 50s and 60s. Many comprehensive and important statewide long-range or "Master Plans" were made during those decades. Indeed, those years really formed the experimental base on which the case was made for federal support for "comprehensive statewide planning" in last year's amendments and the "1202 Commissions."

Little notice has been given by students of the planning and master-planning processes to a change of assumptions basic to these earlier studies and many that are now in progress or recently released. I believe the change is very significant, and that it deserves much more exposure and analytical examination. There is a shift from an assumption stressing clarification of institutional purposes and separation of institutional missions to one which stresses multiple delivery systems and "options." The earlier statewide projections of designs for postsecondary education were based on planned and coordinated statewide coverage of a state's needs for postsecondary educational services which stressed differentiation of educational purposes and missions among different types of institutions. In the jargon of the day, the idea was to study, decide, and describe the "role and scope" of the several colleges or delivery systems in the various states. There were many such "role and scope" studies, with specific examples in Mississippi in 1965, in Michigan in the early 60s, and in Florida earlier. Among the more recently released statewide plans of higher education, however, only Oklahoma has shown sharp focus on the "role and scope" approach to planning and to helping the colleges see their *raison d'etre* in the overall state design. This state's approach to comprehensive statewide planning is, in my view, currently the best in the nation.

Other more recently released statewide plans, while giving a nod of the head to the notion of institutional role-goal clarification and definition, are increasingly laying groundwork for "multiple delivery systems." Sometimes the proposals are for clearly competing systems to serve given clientele in the populace; the urban centers, cooperative college centers, and the community colleges in New York State's 1968 and 1972 Plans are examples. The projection of "open university" approaches paralleling the services of existing university extension programs in several other statewide plans is another. Other plans are less open in their proposals that the notion of clearly distinguishable and administrable differences in "role and scope" of colleges and universities is no longer viable for state planning purposes. Nevertheless, their suggestions that this ought to be kept open can be identified.

The roots of the changes of assumptions for planning just noted include such items as the influence of the Carnegie Commission's report *Less Time, More Options*. They also include the rigidity of existing institutions. Resistance to changes is described by the two very critical Newman Reports, which emphasize the need to find ways to reach large and

important segments of the American population who up until the mid-60s were not well served by higher education.

But in all these good things lies a danger—"open competition," or "turfsmanship" as Joseph Cosand put it in his speech in Baltimore, Maryland at the Association of Governing Boards Conference in May 1973. Planning and coordination appear to be giving way to "power plays" and to untrammeled, costly competition. The danger, of course, is that the supporting taxpayers and legislators may ultimately begin to ask very difficult and embarrassing questions as to what extent all this is really educationally sound and economically feasible and defensible.

Fifth among the conditions in postsecondary education relating meaningfully to this topic is the growing attention being given to the needs for adequate information and data for decision making and planning. This is part of a need for improved use of knowledge about postsecondary operations and practices. Important conferences center on such topics as "The Management of Change," or "Training Program in Systems Planning for Academic Administrators in Developing Colleges."

These five elements in American postsecondary education can give us heart! Planning is on the increase and judicious information gathering *is* needed. While perhaps tortuous and twisted, the pathway forward is well directed and the work has to be done. However, all assumptions must be kept clear and open, carefully examined, and hopefully defensible.

Impact of "1202 Commissions"

In all these widespread and intense discussions the injection of the proposed "1202 Commissions" served as an added catalyst. They were put into the law to assure that all parties interested and involved in the total postsecondary educational program in a state would be afforded a voice in the educational plan which would serve as a basis for federal support. The law stipulates that for a state to qualify for particular federal fiscal programs, its governor must create or designate a commission "broadly representative" of all postsecondary agencies and institutions in the state which will be responsible for developing a comprehensive plan for the state. Representation must include all types of colleges, schools, and universities: 2-year, 4-year, public, private, and *proprietary* institutions.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 have had a rocky time in general, and the "1202" clause has matched that in its specific experience. Under Dr. Joseph Cosand's leadership, quick action was taken after the law was signed by the President. Cosand organized several "task forces" from the field to help formulate guidelines and regulations to implement the

legislation. Dr. John Phillips was finally chosen to head up the "task force" on the "1202 Commissions" and he did, in fact, promulgate several draft reports.

As discussion on the definition of the "1202 Commissions'" guidelines and regulations proceeded, however, the lines of disagreement became more and more sharp. The large powerful, prestigious universities, public and private, did not like the idea of anything that might either actually serve as, or even threaten to become, a "superboard" over their planning, programming, or support functions. And, quite frankly, the public community colleges were very fearful about the potential results that would flow from "1202 Commissions" which might be dominated by the typically more prestigious universities in their states. The strength of feeling and disagreement is clear in the following remarks taken from "Memo from the Executive Director: The 1202 Commissions" in the January 16, 1973, newsletter of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

The portentious issue of the form and authority of the state planning commissions required by Section 1202 of the Education Amendments of 1972 evoked quick and thoughtful responses from many members of the Association to an "Issue Paper" presented to them by the Office of Education.

Copies of 16 letters and analyses were received in the Association office from institutional heads who wrote to Dr. Phillips. One particularly forceful one was signed by six university-system heads who happened to be gathered on the campus of the University of North Carolina.

The memo names the signers, who included the chief executives of the University of Illinois, the University of North Carolina, the University of California, the University of Texas, the University of Missouri, and the University of Wisconsin, and quotes from parts of their letter:

Great concern was expressed regarding the use of the word "coordination" throughout the Issue Paper to describe the Federally-required functions of the 1202 Commissions State Commission. The functions of these State Commissions as required under Title X and authorized by Section 1203 are *planning* functions. Nowhere in the language of the law or in legislative history is *coordination* set forth as a function of the State Commission parallel to that of planning. Yet, in the General Assumptions and throughout the paper, planning *and* coordination are mentioned together.

The statement concludes with this little wrap-up:

The problem is an old and grievous one: people of good will will disagree in a fundamental and perhaps irreconcilable sense over the way that higher education in the states should go. We hope this is a fair statement of it: our institutional heads, steeped in careers on university campuses, recognize the trend and need for state

planning to maximize effective use of the states' resources in higher education. But they prize institutional autonomy and want as much freedom as possible for states to move in their own way to solve their own problems. Others of different backgrounds seem to see coordination and centralized control almost as values in themselves. They want the state planning commission to reinforce these values to the maximum extent possible.

There are in these statements very strong and very powerful voices saying "no" to "1202 Commissions," and especially to any implied extension of coordinating authority.

The divided positions taken by spokesmen for higher education on the issue of the "1202 Commissions" served to cool interest in and to complicate action on the work in the USOE toward implementation of the law. The resultant slowdown was reinforced by President Nixon's decision to withhold federal funds. As a result of both of these forces, then Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education John Ottina reported in a letter to the field on March 7, 1973, that all action toward implementation of the "1202 Commission" legislation was being tabled indefinitely.

This is not to say that the "1202 Commission" proposals have not already been an influence on state planning for postsecondary education. Quite the contrary, the proposition has had large impact and all indications are that it will be larger still in the months immediately ahead. The big question is, however, will there be greater unity and cooperative effort among postsecondary educational institutions, or will they (like the children in the story in the prologue) be driven farther and farther apart?

In preparing this presentation, I wrote to all members of NCSDC-JC seeking information on:

1. official action by the governor;

2. official action by the legislature;

3. official action by the state-level boards or agencies responsible for postsecondary education; and, finally,

4. whether or not any of these had made any difference in:
   (a) approaches to planning,
   (b) procedures followed or types of data gathered for planning or budgeting purposes.

As usual, cooperation from colleagues was excellent. 38 replies from 37 states and Puerto Rico came in time for this report. It was interesting to compare these responses with results of a telephone survey made by higher

education staff at the Education Commission of the States and reported in March 1973, to the ECS panel on "Statewide Planning and Coordination."

There can be no doubt that the law started action. 7 states reported official governor action; 15 states reported official legislative action; 23 states reported formal attention by state agencies; and 8 reported serious unofficial action of one kind or another. Clearly, a large majority of the states gave and are giving serious attention to the "1202 Commission" possibilities, even in face of the stop action message from Washington. One can only imagine what will happen when that is withdrawn!

Some evidence in reply to that thought is seen in the forward thinking action of the Education Commission of the States in creating the special committee just mentioned. The scenario that seems to be unfolding is that the Committee's report (due in summer 1973) may appear just at about the time the wheels of action start rolling again on the "1202 Commissions." That this reactivation may occur seems possible in the light of Congressional Committee activity in the spring of 1973. Congressman O'Hara stated forcefully that as he "read law," federal funds for planning efforts of "1202 Commissions" would have to be released if states acted on the law as written: reported formation of the Commission, and petitioned payment from the U.S. Commissioner of Education, that, in his judgment, the law reads forthrightly, was duly passed by the Congress, and was signed by the President. Therefore, it is law, and all it takes to get the money from the federal government is to comply with what the law says. The governor is to designate or create a commission to report that fact and the belief that the state has complied with the law to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and to request the planning money provided for in the legislation. According to Congressman O'Hara's position and his reading of the law, the U.S. Commissioner has no choice but to provide the money. From Mr. O'Hara's point of view, there is nothing in the legislation that requires development and use of further guidelines, regulations, or anything of that sort.

But the questions remain. Will the results be unifying in postsecondary education or divisive? Will they benefit the purposes of community-junior colleges in state planning or will they complicate and impede? Let me quote several sample replies from the state directors to my survey letter. They show two things.

1. How much ferment its 1202 issue is creating.

2. How divided the views are on the questions.

The quotations will also show clearly that there has been an impact already on state-level thought and operations.

One respondent wrote:

To date no official action has been taken by the Governor or the Legislature on this matter. However, in formal discussions and considerations the Governor and a number of the state-level boards responsible for postsecondary education in the state have been considering this issue. The discussions, to date, have definite implications for taking a new look at the approach to planning for postsecondary education and to developing improved procedures for collecting data from the operating institutions for statewide planning and budgeting purposes.

Another respondent wrote:

The State Department of Education, in conjunction with the state community colleges, has set up a series of meetings to discuss problems in both secondary and postsecondary vocational/technical education. There is no question that these meetings are engendered by the proposed 1202 Commission's proposition.

Another respondent reported language from proposed state legislation as follows:

The Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) afford the state the opportunity to draw together programs widely scattered outside the statewide university system, but which are related to postsecondary, and especially higher education, that would be more effectively administered by a more visible single agency and, thus, more clearly and directly accountable to the Legislature and to the people.

In this quotation from the legislation, the key items are the phrases "a more visible single agency" and the intent to establish a tie with "administration."

Another respondent wrote:

It is clearly the intent of Congress that programs developed under both Part A and Part B of the Amendments of the Higher Education Act and those supported under the Vocation Education Act of 1963, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Health Service Act, and related activities administered by various departments and agencies be coordinated and drawn together to provide a total educational delivery system without unnecessary and excessive duplication. This interpretation of the 1202 Commission in one of the states is clearly an extension of what is in the Federal legislation.

Still another states, "I have a feeling there has been some influence on state planning from all the activities even though it is not yet so readily visible."

And, in a final quote:

The President of the university has been doing some considerable thinking about the 1202 Commission. He dislikes very much the idea of a superboard and his immediate proposal is that the Governor designate a Board of Regents of the State University as the 1202 Commission. Some of us have looked upon the 1202 Commission as a way to strengthen the community colleges in (name of state omitted) state but that possibility is now remote, given the present stance of the President.

The real problem that confronts us is the proprietary schools and how they will fit into the 1202 Commission and its operations.

These illustrative cases should suffice to show that there is more than idle talk going on concerning the 1202 Commissions. Rather, there is serious attention being paid the matter and considerable action evaluating it.

Simultaneous Related Special Interests in Information: Its Acquisition, Use, and Control

I have already touched on some of the reasons why everybody seems to be getting into the information gathering, analyzing, and (to some extent) disseminating act. I wish I could tell you it was going to get easier or slow down, but that would be misleading. Actually, all indications are that such activities will increase. Even the National Association of Manufacturers is pushing us for more information. The special committee on education of the National Association of Manufacturers came out recently with a rather scathing statement, in a pamphlet entitled *Occupational Education in Community Colleges*, on the inability of postsecondary institutions—not just colleges and universities—to supply any substantive reply to questions about their operations. The implication clearly is that postsecondary education cannot describe very well either its productivity or its practices. This criticism, it would appear, applied not only to community and junior colleges, to which the NAM statement was addressed, but to all colleges and universities—the whole group.

There is rising competition over use and control of data information sources. The reasons behind the big demand for information are only partially to know better, to understand more clearly, to appreciate and be sensitive to the problems and needs of postsecondary education. The drive to get and to have information is also motivated by desires on the part of some to manage and to control the operations of postsecondary institutions. It is a frequent observation that "knowledge and information is power" and "he who has control of information has power to control."

Those in positions of state-level responsibility, therefore, should be especially aware of and alert to the uses and the misuses of information and

the power it provides. The operational assumptions and the long-range implications of proposals that are being advanced in support of more information getting and the way they are intended for use should be carefully studied. There are, for example, different philosophical and leadership postures and principles behind these two quite different statements. One, "The Management of Change through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge," by Ronald G. Havelock of the Columbia University Faculty, is taken from the report, *Management of Change*, mentioned earlier. Throughout his thesis, Havelock advances the proposition that information is best provided to help people do a job, to meet objectives, to know how well they are doing. That posture contrasts with one quite explicitly stated in the special report *Comprehensive Information Systems for Statewide Planning in Higher Education* brought out a few years ago by The American College Testing Program. In that report, Ben Lawrence, with WICHE at the time and now Staff Director for the National Commission of Financing Postsecondary Education, made some extremely provocative statements. In discussing the characteristics of management information systems, Ben Lawrence differentiated between "operational" level "management information" systems needed for day-to-day operations in institutions of higher education, and "planning" level "management information" systems for use at higher levels of the organizational structure but built upon data from the operational level in the system. He predicted that all this terminology about operating level and planning level management information will be obsolete in 5 to 10 years; this was written 3 years ago so that many of the 5 to 10 are already gone. He went on to pose the question: Why? Now I am quoting him directly.

> Because the art of information science is developing in such a way that it will be technically possible and economically feasible to have a totally integrated information system in five to ten years. A totally integrated system is one in which the raw data are collected and stored for subsequent retrieval and analysis into meaningful information for use at (1) the operational level within the institution, (2) decision making within the institution, and (3) the state-level within the system of higher education. It is organized in such a way that the system may be looked at as an entity rather than as several systems developed for different purposes.

The thrust of the last sentence in that observation is that it is now technologically possible and economically feasible to view the post-secondary enterprise as a single entity and in doing so to permit or encourage loss of the identity, the reason for being of the subparts, the operating campuses and institutions, if you will.

That type of transformation in the structure for some parts of post-secondary education is actually happening in some states. The move toward getting information for purposes of centralization and control and the eradication of identity of operating parts of institutions is a planned thrust in some states.

I am not saying that this is good or bad at the moment. I am saying: Be aware of it. Know what you are doing, for the consequences are great. Once action in a given direction is initiated, it is very hard to reverse.

Some Implications for State Planning for Community-junior Colleges

Some implications for community/junior colleges, and especially for state-level planning, can be pointed out. First, state planning will not be stopped. It is here; it is going to continue; it is proceeding toward greater comprehensiveness and scope. I think all of this basically is good and should be encouraged and supported. The question is not whether or not it should go on, but how it is going to go on and to what end.

The big issues are institutional relations, more central control (or as Gleazer says in *Project Focus*, "Who Calls the Shots?"), and financial support. The first big question in this regard really is: Who, what agencies, what delivery systems are going to be involved, recognized, and given a role to play in a state plan for postsecondary education? Who is going to be on the team? The second question is: If on the team what position will each player on the team play?

This may sound like the old role and scope business mentioned earlier, but really it is not. The former was premised on a rational planning assumption and decision making approach. The new game may be quite different. It may be a deterioration into encouraged competition and straight power plays. Again, there are relevant recent writings on this subject, particularly Lyman Glenny's recent analysis of trends in state support of public and private institutions which is available from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley. The relationship of the tie-in support to public and private institutions within the total outlay of the states for postsecondary education is shifting. The evidence is clear: the states are not really putting proportionately a great deal more money into postsecondary education, and what is provided is being cut up differently among the several component institutions.

In order to forestall open competition, if that is a state's goal, there must be sound statewide planning and coordination, processes which need to be better understood. There is a difference between statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary educational institutions and their control and governance. The two types of functions at the state level need to be understood and kept sharply separated by policy boards and operating staffs or serious disfunctions will quite surely result.

Others have noted the same danger and advanced the same caveat. An especially cogent observation was made in this regard by Fred Harcleroad

in the Preface to *Comprehensive Information Systems for Statewide Planning in Higher Education*:

> In some instances, coordinating boards with strong staff members have gone beyond their de jure powers and, in fact, perform many of the control functions of governing boards.

Again, the warning is quite clear; and although given 3 years ago, it is just as valid now as then.

Conclusions

Four conclusions can be drawn from these developments. *First*, comprehensive statewide planning is "on the in." It is going to become more prevalent. There is no escaping it. It is either that choice or out-and-out power politics and institutional operations, and I discard that latter as a viable alternative.

Second, state planning and coordination are moving steadily toward encompassing all of the postsecondary level, and will include the proprietary schools, the trade schools, the community colleges, the complex universities and professional schools. All institutions will be reached, in one way or another, and the process will not even need federal legislation anymore to keep it moving. The momentum is sufficient at the state level to cause it to happen even with the "stop action" position on the "1202 Commissions" in Washington.

I would like to build a little bit more on the *third* conclusion. In my judgment, state planning and coordination, in the future, will be more related to *systems* of institutions or delivery *systems* in postsecondary education and less related to individual operating campuses or institutions. This may appear, at first, to be a direct antithesis to what I said earlier about pressure and planned efforts to homogenize or unitize the postsecondary enterprise in some states, but it is not. My conclusion is that the planning and coordinating task will not involve more institutions but more *clusters* of institutions, and within each of these clusters or systems there will be internal responsibility for planning and coordinating the components of that particular cluster or system. The result will be a clear denial of the possibility of a single state board to govern or control, operationally, all postsecondary institutions. In my opinion no state is going to have a governing board with authority over the proprietary institutions, the community colleges, the private institutions, and the others mentioned previously.

What I see happening is that these clusters of institutions, with differentiated clientele and other background elements will become subsystems which will then have to be coordinated and planned as subsystems at the state level. This is going to become the state-level planning and coordinating task and challenge of the future rather than the governing attempt of actual campus operation.

In a book Hollis and I wrote in 1960, based on a look at the several state-level boards responsible for higher education at that time, we made the generalization that there is a limit to the span of control of institutions that any governing board could hope actually to control. But when one is considering coordination, it is a different picture. It is possible to plan for and coordinate a complex and ramified array of institutions and systems of institutions. Therefore, I think a shift of interest and intention from control to planning and coordination of *systems* of postsecondary education is going to have to happen.

The *fourth* conclusion is that changes will occur in the leadership and power structure in postsecondary education in a nearly explosive way in some states, and in a more gradual way in others. But the thing many have not thought of in regard to this change is that it is going to affect the baccalaureate and higher degree granting colleges, particularly those of less prestigious reputations, more than it is the proprietary institutions, the technical schools, and the community-junior colleges. The leadership of the 4-year colleges and universities may not be aware of it yet, but when they get involved in this kind of comprehensive statewide planning and coordination enterprise, their institutions are going to be changed more than are the other types just mentioned. John Hannah, former President of Michigan State, made a speech in the mid-50s when the master planning effort there was going on full force, called "No Master Plan!", in which he gave notice that Michigan State was going to fight the idea tooth and nail. And they did. This slowed the process down a great deal however, once it "took" the changes began to take shape and Michigan State changed, too.

In a sense, the more prestigious colleges and universities, public or private, in the emerging broad coordination of systems are really caught. If they come into the enterprise, then they must deal, they must associate, they must relate and bargain. In that exchange, they are going to be changed. The only other viable course that I can see for them is to choose to stay out, to say that they will not be part of this more or less cooperative coordinating and planning process, that they will let other institutions go their way as they choose to follow their own. I do not think that, however, is likely to happen.

Recommendations

I will conclude with five recommendations.

First, the community-junior college leadership at the state level, state directors, should join with colleagues (college presidents and local planners) to seek together the right to continue doing your own planning. This does not mean that this should be done in isolation from others. But it should be your own rather than work done entirely by other interests who would do it, if they do it at all, on their own terms.

Second, community-junior colleges should carry on this state level planning in coordination and cooperation with other systems. This simply is a rational and realistic fact of life today and is consistent with the facts explained earlier. Plan, but do it in this broader framework. However, this coordination of effort should not lead to abandonment of essential needs or the development of plans that are inimical to the purposes of community-junior colleges.

Third, community-junior colleges must get the information which will be needed for state-level planning. They must have the essential information which serves their purposes even if secured by other agencies. If other interests always do the defining for community-junior colleges and if other interests control getting the information, there will be no assurance of the power to plan and coordinate which comes from information appropriate and sufficient to these purposes.

Fourth, once having the information and having developed internal plans and procedures for coordination with other sectors of postsecondary education, community-junior colleges should, in my judgment, insist on the right to disseminate these plans and these conclusions. Otherwise, they will be trusting to the spokesmanship of others which, as experience in many places shows well, just does not work out to the benefit of community-junior colleges. Nobody can speak as knowledgeably, as energetically, as enthusiastically on behalf of this enterprise better than those who are in it. This, it should be observed in all fairness, is true also of each of the other sectors of postsecondary education and is the reason why I think the "1202 Commission" type of planning effort is so essential.

Fifth and last, I believe community-junior college planners at the state level should expedite or accelerate the shift of information use away from management purposes and toward evaluation and accountability purposes. I can think of no better way to close this presentation than to call attention again to the four-element model for statewide coordinating boards or commissions developed by Fred Harcleroad in the background report distributed at this conference. Number three of the four basic

elements in the model is the need for "appraisal and evaluation of institutional achievement of approved objectives, including fiscal post-audit and analysis of institutional application of statewide policies and guidelines." I close by strongly endorsing his statement. If you get "management information" data for the four purposes he outlined, and particularly this one of evaluation, you will not have done injustice to the institutions and postsecondary education. Rather you will have helped them along.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 19 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ESSAYS ON EDUCATION

NUMBER FOUR IN A SERIES: S.V. MARTORANA